

Businesses potentially acquired for maximum terminal expansion total 99.

As noted, homes are now located on a relatively small portion of the non-railroad property that may be used for the intermodal terminal. Yet other properties are being used for commercial or industrial purposes. Some will require environmental remediation, a challenge successfully addressed before on other properties in and around the area (e.g., removal of underground storage tanks, remediation of lead-based foundry sands, and the like).

Acquisition of property for terminal expansion would likely involve no structures of historic significance. However, if the project moves forward, more research will be undertaken to determine if a non-contiguous historic district(s) encompassing a spread of 19th Century residential and commercial buildings surrounds the easterly part of the terminal expansion area.

The archaeological potential for this area is limited, but not negligible, to pre-sanitary sewer, first-generation development of this area which dates, in part, to 1875. If further work uncovers archaeological resources they will be either excavated or preserved in place after consultation with the Michigan State Historic Preservation Officer.

The effects of Rail Strategy 3 on community cohesion are considered neutral. The intermodal terminal will include a buffer between it and the surrounding area. The buffer is considered a development that will support cohesiveness. Likewise, the grade separation of Lonyo and Central under the rail yard tracks is considered a development that supports the long-term cohesiveness of the community. Otherwise, it is likely trains, which could be one mile long when fully assembled, could regularly block one or both of those streets.

Under Rail Strategy 3, the daily fuel consumption is forecast to be (Table S-2):

Table S-2
Daily Forecast Fuel Consumption (2025)
(Gallons per Day)

Vehicle Type	Usage
Line Haul Locomotives	7,919
Switch Locomotives	672
Outside Trucks	6,929
Terminal Operations	3,583
Other	300
Total	19,403

Source: Arbor Vista Transportation

The air quality effects forecast for activities within the intermodal terminal for Rail Strategy 3 are shown on Table S-2A. As the analysis goes forward, these expected emissions will be quantified for Rail Strategies 1 and 2. Additionally, consultation with EPA indicates that the regional effects of consolidating intermodal activity at one location will need to be measured for its overall effect. This will involve both highway and rail activities.

Table S-2A
DIFT Pollutant Burden Forecast
(annual metric tons)

	RR Strategy 3 (2025)			
	HC	CO	Nox	PM
Locomotives	23	86	410	14
Trucks	18	137	82	4
Terminal Operations	14	109	38	2
Other	7	96	2	NA
Total	62	428	532	20

Evaluation of Roadway Alternatives

Seventeen areas that are most likely to be affected by the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project have been chosen for analysis (Table S-3, Figure S-9).

Table S-3
Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project
Analysis Segments

Analysis Segment	From Location	To Location
Wyoming 1	Michigan	Porath Ct./I-94 Exit Ramp
Wyoming 2	Eagle	Vernor
Lonyo	Michigan	John Kronk
Springwells	RR Overpass	I-75 Service Drive
Central 1	I-94	John Kronk
Central 2	Dix	RR Overpass
Central 3	RR Overpass	I-75 Service Drive
Cecil	I-94	Michigan
Waterman	Desmond	I-75 Service Drive
Livernois 1	I-94	John Kronk
Livernois 2	John Kronk	Toledo
Livernois 3	Toledo	I-75 Service Drive
Dragoon	Livernois	I-75 Service Drive
Clark	Vernor	I-75 Service Drive
West Grand/MLKing	Michigan	I-96
Rosa Parks	I-96 Service Drive	Bagley
Truck Road	Livernois	Springwells

Source: The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc.

Eight criteria (listed alphabetically) have been selected for use in the evaluation:

- Air Quality
- Community Cohesion
- Displacements
- Engineering Difficulty
- Environmental Justice
- Historic Properties
- Noise
- Traffic Flow

The eight evaluation factors were scored by three groups: members of the Local Advisory Council (12 participated); the general public (59 participated); and, the Technical Team (20 participated) (Figure S-10).

Comparison of the results indicates the Local Advisory Council and the public are within 0.5 points for four of the factors (Table S-4). The larger differences are in the areas of air quality, displacements, historic and noise. Nevertheless, the two groups agree air quality is the number one issue, and historic is the seventh highest in weight.

Table S-4
Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Feasibility Study
Evaluation Factor Weighting

Evaluation Factor	Local Advisory Council ¹	Public ²	Technical Team ³
Air Quality	14.24% (1) ⁴	15.16% (1)	14.43% (1)
Community Cohesion	13.65% (2)	13.86% (2)	13.51% (3)
Displacements	14.10% (3)	12.96% (5)	12.93% (4)
Engineering Difficulty	7.91% (8)	8.29% (8)	9.86% (7)
Environmental Justice	13.55% (4)	13.51% (3)	12.80% (6)
Historics	9.88% (7)	10.50% (7)	9.70% (8)
Noise	13.68% (5)	13.00% (4)	12.81% (5)
Traffic Flow	12.99% (6)	12.72% (6)	13.96% (2)
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Source: The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc.

¹Twelve participated.

²Fifty-nine participated.

³Twenty participated.

⁴Number in parenthesis indicates rank order of evaluation factor among the eight factors.

The Technical Team has almost identical ratings with either the public or the Local Advisory Council for five of the eight evaluation factors. The largest differences are where the Technical Team rates engineering difficulty and traffic flow higher by one point or more. The difference between the Technical Team and the other two groups is less than one point in the area of environmental justice. Overall, these ratings indicate significant agreement among the three groups.